REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-12, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0217176 Beunings et al. (Beunings) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0193687 to Christensen et al. (Christensen). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "defining a context object for inclusion in a message, the context object being an abstraction of content of the message, the context object defined in a repository, the context object including a name and a namespace, the name of the context object used to access payload information; assigning the context object to one or more interfaces through which the message is to be communicated, the context object used to select a send process for the message sent to at least one of the assigned interfaces, the context object providing context information to enable send steps that send messages of the same interface from different places in a process to be distinguished; and accessing, via the context object, the content of the message at one of the interfaces" (for support, see, inter alia, specification par. 26). Claims 6 and 11 were similarly amended.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite: "defining a context object for inclusion in a message, the context object being an abstraction of content of the message, the context object, stored in a repository, including criteria to enable reuse across one or more interfaces, the context object providing the criteria for determining one or more send steps at one of the interfaces the context object including a name and a namespace, the context object being used to differentiate

send steps that a part of the same process that are being sent on the same interface, the name of the context object used to access payload information; assigning, to the one or more interfaces through which the message is to be communicated, the context object describing the message, the context object used to select a send process for the message sent to at least one of the assigned interfaces; and accessing, via the context object, the content of the message at one of the interfaces, wherein accessing the content includes accessing application data associated with the context object" (for support, see, inter alia, specification par. 26).

For a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Office "bears the initial burden of factually supporting any prima facie conclusion of obviousness" and must therefore present "a clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious." MPEP §2142. An obviousness rejection "cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." MPEP §2141 quoting *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1386, 1385 (2007). This rationale must include a showing that all of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and that one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, to produce a combination yielding nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. *KSR*, 82 USPQ2d at 1395. MPEP §2141.02 further notes that "a prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the subject matter recited in the pending claims. *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). It is respectfully submitted that the stated rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) fail to satisfy this burden with regard to the currently pending claims.

As previously stated, Beunings describes a routing object rather than the recited context object. Beunings describes the routing object as a pointer to a specific part of a message rather than as a context object configured to provide the features recited in claim 1 (e.g., "includes a name and a name space", "providing context information to enable send steps that send messages of the same interface from different places in a process to be distinguished").

The current amendments were made to further differentiate the routing objects of Beuning with the context objects of the current application. While the routing objects of Beuning do provide for message routing, it is respectfully submitted that Beuning is silent as to context objects that provide context information which enables send steps that same message of the same interface from different places in a process to be distinguished. Without such context information, the send steps might not be able to be distinguished because they are part of the same process and are sent on the same interface (and routing can only use the process name and the interface name) (see, inter alia, specification par. 26).

Christensen was cited as allegedly teaching that a context object includes a name and a namespace and that the name of the context object can be used to access payload information. It is respectfully submitted that Christensen fails to explicitly disclose such features. In the office action par. 27 of Christensen was cited as recited a message object that includes a message header collection 110. Par. 32 of Christen was also cited and such paragraph recites:

In an example embodiment, the message header collection 110 has a find method for finding individual headers within the header collection. Find is commonly used by header-specific message handlers to retrieve the appropriate header, either by the type of header, the XML element name of the header, the XML namespace in which the header is defined, and/or the actor/role corresponding to the endpoint for which the header is targeted. All headers are buffered for simplicity within the constraints of available memory, but as indicated above, nothing in the present invention precludes streaming one or more headers, if appropriate for a particular implementation. To further guard against denial of service attacks, a memory quota, for example 32 k bytes, may be established for buffering headers.

While this passage recites XML element name of the header and the XML namespace, it fails to suggest that the name of the context object can be used to access payload information as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, the skilled artisan would not have resulted in the claimed subject matter by combining Beunings with Christensen. Therefore, the claims should be allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fee is believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-090 / 2003P00732US. If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 25 November 2009

/ck3/
Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No. 42,773

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Customer No. 64280
Tel.: 858/314-1535
Fax: 858/314-1501